

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application.

Specification and Claims

Minor changes have been made to the specification and claims to place them in better form for U.S. practice.

Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed on December 15, 2004 citing five (5) Japanese patent publications.

In the Form PTO/SB/08 that was returned to Applicants together with the Office Action, the Examiner crossed out JP 6-18052 Y2 and did not provide a reason as to why it was not considered. A partial English translation of relevant portion of this JP prior art document was provided when the Information Disclosure Statement was filed. JP 6-18052 Y2 is also discussed in page 2 of the specification of the present application.

In view of this, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider this JP document, or contact Maki Hatsumi at 703-205-8000 prior to issuance of the next office action and provide reasons as to why this document cannot be considered.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8, 9, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the wording and language of the body of each claim is inconsistent with the preamble.

The rejected claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2, 4/2, 5/4/2, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kataoka et al. (USP 5,859,365). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kataoka discloses, in Fig. 1, a fuel tank 1 for a motor vehicle that includes a tank body 3 constituting the outer casing of the tank, and a soft sack 5 for accommodating fuel F, disposed in the internal space of the tank body 3. The sack 5 partitions the internal space of the tank body 3 into a fuel chamber 7 for accommodating fuel and a pressure adjusting chamber 9 communicating with the atmosphere. Thus, the fuel F accommodated in the fuel chamber 7 is segregated from the atmosphere (see col. 6, lines 10-19).

Therefore, the tank body 3 of Kataoka (which, according to the Examiner, corresponds to the “first container” of the claimed invention of the present application) does not define “only a single space therein for directly storing liquid fuel.” Accordingly, Kataoka fails to disclose or suggest the “first container” as recited in claim 2.

Claims 4 and 5, variously dependent on claim 2, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 2.

Claim 9 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with respect to claim 2.

More specifically, Kataoka fails to disclose or suggest the step of “providing a first container defining only a single space therein for directly storing liquid fuel,” as recited in claim 9.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green (USP 5,556,002). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Green discloses, in a drawing, a measured liquid dispensing system having a bulk reservoir 12 (corresponds to the “first container” of the claimed invention of the present application), a pressure tank 14 (corresponds to the “second container”), a conduit system 16 (corresponds to the “second pipe line”), and a pump 18 and a filling valve 20 (which collectively corresponds to the “feeding means”).

In Green, however, the pump 18 is required to feed liquid inside the bulk reservoir 12 to the pressure tank 14 because the pressure inside the bulk reservoir 12 is not “maintained higher than” the pressure inside the pressure tank 14, as required in claim 3.

Claim 10 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with respect to claim 3.

More specifically, Green fails to disclose or suggest the step of “maintaining a pressure inside the first container higher than a pressure inside the second container,” as recited in claim 10.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 4/1, 5/4/1, 6, and 7 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph:

Claim 8 has been amended to overcome the Section 112, second paragraph rejection, and thus believe that it is now in condition for allowance.

A favorable determination and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No.: 10/517,836
Reply dated January 18, 2006
to Office Action of October 18, 2005
Page 30 of 30

Docket No.: 1602-0191PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  (reg. # 40,417)
for Terrell C. Birch
Registration No.: 19,382
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant